

Meeting of Wednesday, May 4th, 1966. Group III.

M-978.

Mr. Nyland: Who's new? ----- Good. What will we talk about?

Peter Nijinsky: I have a couple of questions, Mr. Nyland. This is a situation: I have been in a state of fight during the last couple of weeks regarding the question of growing up, or, as one might say, being aware of being a machine, and transferring, or trying to transfer into what we can call man. Regarding this question - -

Mr. Nyland: What do you want to become, a man?

Peter N.: A man.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Peter N.: Or trying to grow up into a man. In this relationship I have a couple of questions. First of all, is it possible to apply my knowledge, in quotes, knowledge which I received from now, into what I will receive and learn from now on? The second question is: how is it possible for me to relate to other human beings and not run into a state of what I can call isolation, at least in a temporary period?

Mr. Nyland: Who wants to answer? Not everybody at the same time. Let's say this: are they questions that have to do with consciousness? The problem of growing up exists for everyone, to have an aim of some kind, of course, whatever it may be, in life. The question of relating to other people also exists. The question of using one's knowledge - of course it's obvious. Now if I value any of those, and I'm afraid that I would lose them if I try to become conscious, that of course is a question of trying to buy something, a cat in a bag. I don't know what consciousness is, but I do know

what the value of knowledge is, and what my future might be if I use the knowledge. So you have to settle that first. What kind of desire is there in order to become conscious, if one can, or at least to make attempts? And that is perhaps a little difficult since you don't know what is meant by it. And the whole question then reverts to: what is it that I would like to become? If that is then in the direction of becoming more conscious, then I can more or less by extrapolation say that what I am not now, I will then try to get rid of it in order to substitute something that is more positive. So for you I think for that you have to be very clear first if that is really what you want. Otherwise there is no use using the terminology of growing up or evolving, or trying to wake up, or becoming conscious, or becoming a man. Because what is a man in that kind of a definition? And that I think you have to settle for yourself.

All of that, of course, whatever is projected in the future, depends entirely on the potentiality that I have now. And if this potentiality is desirable enough for me, that I think that it might lead, if I continue in the same way, to something that is more worthwhile because I will acquire more knowledge, and probably more maturity, then perhaps, - why would it be necessary to become conscious?

You see, the fundamental question is: is anything at the present time in the state in which I am now, and which I call unconscious - has that a possibility of being solved, where it could become conscious? And what is then consciousness for me, if I could express it in what are now for me unconscious terminology? But let's assume for a moment that you have settled that question and that you want

to become conscious. And here is a certain method, outlined, of what you should do, and certain things that you now become clear about in your mind - that what is involved in the practice or in the application of whatever is knowledge about trying to become conscious or objective. And we'll assume now that you know, and assume also that you're willing to try and that you will make honest efforts. Then it is: will I be able to use the knowledge I have at the present time? That is something that concerns you apparently. If Work on oneself would mean that I would do away temporarily, at least temporarily, with certain amount of information that I have now, or that what I now consider a certain satisfactory reason for my existence, then of course it is utter nonsense to think that in following a line of objectivity I have to forego everything that is now my ordinary life. As a matter of fact, if I think that, I don't understand Work, and I have to verify a little bit more what is really involved. If Work means that I become conscious to myself, it also means that I continue to be and do with myself what I am doing now; and that objectivity only would mean that something else is set in motion or is created which simply becomes an observer of that what goes on, and that my ordinary life continues in exactly the same way as it always has been. That of course is quite fundamental.

Now if I want to make an effort to become conscious, that is, to try to observe myself, or to try to create for myself a little "I" that might grow up, which starting out as a kind of objective faculty in myself, then starts to operate, - is there any possible reason to assume that the ordinary activity of my life as I know it now, would interfere with that kind of an attempt? Of course it's

obvious that it will interfere, because if one has to be fed and the other has to be fed, and there is a total amount of energy available within me, then naturally if I divide it, one will get less if I give it to the other. So that if I try to feed or make efforts regarding consciousness, then I will not have as much energy left for my ordinary life. And it may also be that not knowing exactly how to feed the objective direction, that I may be able to spoil what I'm doing in an unconscious way, or that maybe the unconscious part is so predominant that there is no possibility of even feeding a little bit of my objective or objectivity.

Now when I can assume that if I could continue to work and gradually find out what the method means and how to go about it, it might be possible that I can divide it in such a way that there is more or less an even division, so that both will get sufficient for their own maintenance and own growth. I can also assume that when I become more objective, I will change the condition of my life; and it may be possible then to receive not only information, but also energies from different sources, which I at the present time don't touch. And it's also possible that in the state of objectivity the condition of my physical behavior, and including the different functions like feeling and thinking, will then be able, if I consider the feeding of that as a form of feed; that it might be possible in a conscious state to extract more value out of the food which I now take in unconsciously and which then, if I were conscious, will be digested up to a higher degree of digestion.

Now you can choose. But it always comes to this point: if I am up against the difficulty of going one way or the other, at a certain place I have to make up my mind that I either try or I for-

get about it. The reason for that is of course that unless I do something wholeheartedly, I never can expect any kind of a result. And then it depends on one's desire for adventure, or the wish that I really want to accomplish something that I haven't got as yet, and it is desirable for me; or that I am a little bit more disgusted with the condition in which I am, so that I'm up against it; and I want to pursue a particular kind of a road which will give me more satisfaction.

So you see, it's up to you. No one can answer it for you. Because if you say, 'go ahead and do it,' well, you have to do it. No one will tell you to go ahead unless you wish. And if you do it because someone else tells you, I think the person who would tell you is a fool; because if then it doesn't go the right way, you start to blame the other person. Work is entirely a personal responsibility. One must not take the advice from someone else unless it is in order to clarify what one has to do. And then one is on one's own. And if on that particular road I discover certain things that are inexplicable to me, or that look a little dangerous, or for which I have a definite kind of a fear, then of course I won't continue unless I have more spirit of adventure or daring. Or sometimes I say, "Am I on the right road?" And if I then get confirmation from someone in whom I have some confidence, then probably I will say, "Yes, I will continue." Does it answer you?

Peter N.: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Don't worry about losing the knowledge or not being able to use it. Whenever one starts to work in the direction of consciousness, you start from the point of unconsciousness. And you start from the stepping-stone which represents your past. It may not be that immediately everything that you have accumulated in the past

in the form of feeling or dexterity or intellectual ability, that you can use it at that particular moment, all of it. But in ordinary life you don't anyhow. And that much of the stuff that you have already accumulated in education or whatever it may be, afterwards with more maturity proves to be utterly useless. So a lot of the stuff is junk. It is ballast that in time, when one knows and gets a little bit more wisdom, one throws overboard because it is of no use. If one ever studies in any particular direction, academically or not, you know what an amount of nonsense that you have to learn in order to get a degree or certain points, in order to have credits; and that a lot of that what you consider even studying for examinations in order to pass them, you've forgotten all about it already two or three months later because you were cramming, and your mind just couldn't contain it.

The only thing that is valuable for a person is not word knowledge. But it is actual knowledge of what we would call the improvement or the establishment of his being, his level of being. And as far as work on oneself is concerned, that will never be lost. But that there is a lot of sawdust that doesn't belong any more, that of course I can get rid of. And it is good riddance. Don't worry too much. If one is interested, work. Find out for yourself. If it goes the wrong way, and you think you are on the road to perdition, then of course you will stop.

Now, what else? Children, what do you come for? Yes?

Question: (Older man) I have a problem with the word "pride."

Mr. Nyland: Dry?

Question: Pride.

Mr. Nyland: Pride?

Question: Pride. I used to think it was a very simple thing.

Lately it's become very complex to me.

Mr. Nyland: Self-pride?

Question: Self-pride.

Mr. Nyland: Are you afflicted by it?

Question: I think I might be. I probably am. And in trying to get rid of it, I discover it has many facets.

Mr. Nyland: Don't you like it?

Question: Some yes, and some no.

Mr. Nyland: For instance, if you do something right, don't you have pride in your work?

Question: Yes, this part - -

Mr. Nyland: That is justified.

Question: Yes. Isn't?

Mr. Nyland: What isn't?

Question: The pride of just being. . .

Mr. Nyland: That, one can simply say, "I accept myself for whatever it is." There is no particular pride involved in it. You can be happy, and also appreciate the fact that you're alive, and perhaps thankful to your father and mother, or to whatever conditions have brought you to the point where you are. But there is no particular pride as yet because it is simply an exchange of the knowledge for yourself to know that that is there. And the statement is simply, "I am this."

False pride is another question. And it is usually based on an idea or a feeling I have about something that I know in my heart I really don't have; or I have no right to have that which I don't possess, about which I could be proud. That falseness, I think, if

one is honest, gradually one can weed out more and more, unless circumstances compel me to remain hypocritical. Now if I also include in that admiration from some other people regarding myself, and say how wonderful I am, and then I know it is not exactly true, but it feels good; then I have also a certain form of false pride which I know myself very well I don't deserve, but since it feels good it is a little cheap. So I think as far as the pride is concerned, when it is justified and it is based on an exact knowledge of oneself, whatever one has, I think one can be proud about it and happy, and whatever may be involved. When it reaches the direction of falseness and I know it, I should go against it. That is, if it is not in line with remaining honest or even serious, that then it is necessary for me if I want to get rid of it, simply to say, "Don't be a fool. Don't be that proud about something that does not have that particular qualification even." And then simply I say, "I wish to grow up. I'm not a baby any more. I want now to behave like an ordinary man ought to behave, and not over excessively be proud of myself."

It still leaves a certain section that I have a certain form of pride where I honestly believe that I deserve it. And in reality it is not in existence, but I don't know it. In such a case probably other people around me will know a little bit more about myself than I know. And if there are some friends with whom I could really talk and ask them, in many cases of course they won't say or give you the right truthful answer. If you ask them, say, "Do you think I am proud?", they say, "Oh, no, you are not;" and you know from their voice that they really mean, "Yes, you are a little, but I don't dare to tell you."

Constant investigation regarding oneself in different conditions,

whenever you in retrospect consider yourself and your behavior, if you look over the activities of the day and see how you have behaved, particularly in regard to other people, and if there then was for that a little question, I would start with that what I start to question first. And gradually from that I will reach more into the field where things become a little bit more questionable. And after some time I will reach more or less a definite amount of information about myself because I'm not that foolish.

Now regarding the possibility of an objective viewpoint of oneself, that in the sense that when I become really objective to that what I am, I go in the first place in the beginning through a very difficult period. Because from the standpoint of objectivity, pride does not exist. You see, when I am proud I'm identified with it. When I work, I aim to be non-identified. So there is the contradiction. And therefore it will not help me. Whatever facts I accumulate of an absolute kind or an objective kind, will be for the sake of objectivity like a fact. And I will accept it for whatever it is worth. I don't value even the worth. I don't define it as being valuable even. I simply value it from the standpoint of wanting to wake up as something that exists. And that is the way it is.

Now gradually out of this accumulation of data, which in the sense of objectivity is a little bit more reliable because it is closer to the truth, - that is, it is more and more free from personal interpretation or wishes on my own part, - out of that I will gradually distil enough so-called essential data about myself which become incontrovertible for myself. I will know then for sure that certain things are facts, and that I am what I am. And objectively speaking, I then will accept that what I am, even if it means that

I lose a little self-confidence.

You see, this is the process which takes place after the accumulation of data which I might get in an objective state, which nevertheless are stored away in a certain part of my brain. And when my mind starts to function, it will include also the possible memory of such data, even if they have been received objectively. With that, not being a fool, as I said in the beginning, and honestly striving for the truth, - to find out for myself, - I will lean over backwards and start questioning practically everything; and then add from that standpoint of, almost I would say absolute zero, that what I now am sure about that is not involved in any pride whatsoever.

Much of this has a relationship towards the acceptance of oneself, whatever one is, for which one never has become responsible. That is, if I see myself as a creature being born, and simply being fed in the beginning, and then having a certain surrounding and someone to take care of me and give me food; and that also then because of that, certain strength was developed in me, and I have a little capacity that I can put to use and earn some money, and all the rest of it: for that I really am not responsible at all. Because it was set, setting out in a certain direction according to natural ways, and I simply followed whatever particular line was ahead of me.

As soon as there are certain things that I have to overcome as obstacles, and when I make a fight for it; and then in overcoming them I feel a little proud that I have done it, or that I thank God I had the strength, I can either say I did it myself, or I can say it happened fortunately for me, or even I can say religiously, "Thank God that it was possible." Those are the three

things that I can always adapt for myself; and they are completely within the line of my development. And there is no particular harm for the time-being to assume that that what I've done and earned with the sweat of my brow, that now has become a possession for me, I can be proud about it because I've actually made so many sacrifices in order to reach the level where I am at the present time. For the time being simply accept it. Leave it for whatever it is. There is no objection from an objective standpoint even to be concealed. There is no morality involved in this, you see.

There is only one thing, that is, the attempt to wake up. And then if one is awake, many things that are now judged from the standpoint of ordinary earth will not have that kind of a judgment. It changes subjective morality into an objective one. And I don't know enough about objective morality. But I do know that many things that I now consider extremely important because I have been instilled by such, let's call them culture and civilization, or whatever the educational values were, or the surrounding, or the people who were well-meaning, my educators and father and mother and teachers and whatever, have made me what I am now as a civilized person behaving in accordance with certain ethical rules. Well, maybe a great deal of that is utter nonsense. And it is simply because I happen to be born here, and I was not born in Samoa or Australia.

If I start to become a little bit more apart from myself, that is, let's call it objective for a moment although it is not entirely an objectivity, - but I become a little freer, and see myself much more like everybody else might see me, or like I would be if I were born some other place, and that I happen to be here, and therefore I have accumulated a great many of what we say 'acquired character-

istics', - that then for that reason it may not be an essential value for me whenever I become objective and consider myself only as a human being, eating and breathing and sleeping. And the less I now attach values to the different things that of course belong to ordinary earth and have their value on earth, from the standpoint of further growth-which would mean I want to leave earth as soon as I can and in as good condition as I can,-and having paid all the different debts which I perhaps owe, either to Mother Nature or to whatever the conditions may be in which I have lived, that then if I satisfy that kind of a debt, then I'm entitled even to leave. And I can say, "Farewell, proud world, I leave you now the way it is. I am proud of leaving."

Consider it. Don't be too serious about it. I don't think it is really important.

Yes?

David Stoltz: Mr. Nyland, for about the past month or so, I've been giving a lot of thought in a general way about father and son. Now, I've been trying to think how I can formulate this so I could bring it up as a question. And I haven't exactly come up with any question in general to ask, except I remember when I read "The Brothers Karamazov", Dostoevski brought it up a great deal about father and son relation there; and I know I missed the point a great deal. I see this point put up a tremendous amount of times, and I'm completely vague on the whole subject of father and son in a general sense.

Mr. Nyland: Are you a father?

David S.: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: You have a son?

David S.: A daughter.

Mr. Nyland: Father-daughter relationship.

David S.: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: It's different.

David S.: Well, I - - -

Mr. Nyland: Father-child.

David S.: Father-child.

Mr. Nyland: What is the responsibility of parents towards their offspring?

David S.: Yes, and also the responsibility, I guess, of one's parents from our standpoint.

Mr. Nyland: Oh, of you towards your parents?

David S.: Yes, both of these questions have been in my mind, and both of them seem very - - -

Mr. Nyland: Well, the difficulty is that about your parents you cannot do very much.

David S.: Right. I agree with that.

Mr. Nyland: As far as you for yourself are concerned, to become a father or to be a father to your children, that is possible. When you take Dostoevski as an example, you select a very bad one because he was not much of a good father.

David S.: I brought up Dostoevski because he brought it up a great deal. I realize - I guess what I really want to know is my relationship to my daughter.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. I think it is important. And then to that extent if you say that I would like my daughter to be that for me, or rather: "I would like to create such conditions that my daughter can grow up the way I would like her to grow up for her sake, that implies immediately that for yourself you apply your relation toward

your own father. You see, whatever you think that ought to be possible for your daughter, it ought to be possible for you also in relation to your parents.

So let's talk about first what you would want for your daughter or son or children. What would they be? How can they grow up? At what age should one do something about it? What should be the proper attitude, what should be the kind of talk? What kind of an ideal should you hold in front of them? What particular way of teaching should you follow? It depends on the age, and it depends on the receptivity, and it depends on the trust they have in you. The age is something that you must not fool yourself about because children are very receptive already at an early age, and very easily get spoilt already too soon, sometimes not so much by the father and mother, but mostly by well-meaning friends and family. Also of course they get immediately affected in contact with other children.

And let's now assume for the sake of an argument that you would like to have a conscious child, or bring it up in a conscious manner. And then it will be affected by those who are unconscious. It's terribly difficult to offset the influences from other people, when father and mother have an idea what is good for their child. And immediately you run up against the difficulties of so-called 'bon-ton', or that what is considered common or necessary in accordance with certain rules which at the present time of course are in existence among the average class of people. And as soon as one deviates a little bit from that, one is immediately open to all kind of criticism. How to remain strong about that depends entirely on one's own conviction.

But let's assume that one starts at an early age when the child is still impressionable. What is it that the child will take on

easiest? Surely not words, because they don't understand it yet. And they don't understand the content, neither the sense of it. They don't even understand the relation of words, and they don't have any associative values for them to compare it with. The only thing that really appeals, that is, that has an effect, is a certain form of manifestation regarding the child. Manifestation is the only teacher at that time, that what one is as representation of that what one is in one's own life. And that the effect on the child is, how does father and mother behave towards them, and between the two of them, that is, between father and mother. Any amount of disagreement should not be uttered or even expressed in the presence of the child.

Whatever one wants to tell a child has to be shown by one's own behavior. Whenever you want to teach anything, it is not something that you say, "Now go ahead and do it and leave Father alone." But Father has to play with them and build them up, and hold them, as it were, not necessarily by the hand, but in order to give an example of how it is. If a father talks about activity, the father has to be active. If the father talks about getting up early, he has to get up early. If the father indicates that the child should clean up their own mess, the father never should have a mess around either. Nothing will be condoned by a child when it sees what the father or mother is doing. And then it would be a matter of: do in accordance with my words, but don't do it in accordance with my deeds. That of course is obvious; that is common sense.

Now from the standpoint of consciousness, what is it that the child really needs? A child always should remain unspoiled as long as possible. It always should remain impressionable. It should not

be conditioned at too early an age. And it should always have aspiration. If it has that, the child after a little while can stand on its own feet; and with that kind of an equipment can meet the rest of the world. If it is necessary for the child then to fight, or rather to hold its own, it has to have a confidence in someone whom the child can trust. The logical person is of course father and mother.

For that one has to create a family life. This is a certain unit to which the child is willing to return whenever in the outside world it runs into some difficulties. And it always has to be satisfied that the trust is not violated, and that whatever is given as advice can be made acceptable to the child, and so that the child is willing to follow it. And whenever a child loses confidence, one loses then the possibility of any kind of a communication in the future. Because pretty soon after that the child will keep to itself, will not communicate any more because it's, - without saying it in so many words, - it will feel that it is not understood. So the road has to remain constantly open.

Now, father and mother must always remain father and mother as far as the child is concerned. They never should talk down to the child. They never should have, so-called, wanting the child to respect them. But they have to, by their behavior, exact respect from the child, I would almost say, naturally. At the same time, instead of talking down, a father and mother always should be a little bit above the child, so that for the child always there will remain a respect. This is very often forgotten. Sometimes it is as if one wants to become like a child and play with it. It is not truth. One plays with it, but at such a distance that one can still shake hands.

A father and mother never should be too far away from a child

so that sometimes they say, "Ah, wait till you grow older and are as old as I am; then you will understand." That is utter nonsense. A child will never take it. But a child will take it when it is explained in such terms, and still that father and mother retain respect from the child because the child feels then, almost I would say automatically, a certain respect because of certain superior knowledge, or at least a little bit more wisdom.

This all requires a tremendous amount of patience on the part of the father and mother. And it is very difficult to reconcile when father and mother are engaged in their own lives, still have their own desires of some kind, and quite definitely are entitled to their own lives. And in such a case one must never forget that whenever there is a child, there is a responsibility. Like it or not, it is there. And that has to be accepted.

Now how long that responsibility will last, and how soon the child can grow up so that it can stand on its own feet, and, you might say, have father and mother more or less back of her or him, it all depends how the child will develop. And when father and mother can withdraw more or less correctly, depends entirely on the willingness to give it up, and also the understanding that they can give it up. Understanding that they can give it up depends on an unselfish attitude, not a selfish one. A child also will know when father and mother are very selfish, when they want to satisfy their own desires in preference to taking care of the child. It does not mean that one has to lean over backwards, and certainly not that you want to make sissies out of them. And neither do you want the child always to hang on mother's apron strings. They have to be taught early in life that they also have to become responsible persons, that they

must take responsibility, young as they may be, for certain things that have to be done. And then when an order of that kind is given, or it is indicated by a form of behavior which could be an example, that then the child actually has to follow it up, and is punished when it is not doing it. This is of course very difficult because you love the child. You want to forgive it, and sometimes you don't dare to punish; and sometimes it's a little easier not to punish. This I think is the most difficult task for a father and mother to remain really in that way just. But never say anything unless you can fulfill it.

All of this of course you know. It requires a tremendous amount of patience on the part of father and mother. It has to be also an understanding between them, so that it is not left to the father to get the chestnuts out of the fire when mother has spoiled it during the day. Particularly when the father happens to be away and the mother is home with the child, it never pays that the father afterwards spanks the child for something that it has done at nine o'clock in the morning when the father wasn't there and the mother was very much upset. All this has to be straightened out between the two without the child being there.

Never make a child a confidant of father and mother, whatever their discussions are. It remains the private life of the parents, and it will enhance the respectability or respect that they have for father and mother. At the same time one need not wait too long to explain to children the value of life, because at a very early age they have already a good sense of discrimination. And it's not necessary to hide things too long. It's quite necessary to be very open, to be, almost I would say, natural, particularly regards, - it all depends - I don't know how old the child is. - But when it

has to do with the affairs of life, the way people behave, how they are, including sex problems, it can be told at a very early age in a very simple way, without making too much fuss.

Now also as far as protecting them from the outside world, from influences which are deleterious even for father and mother, never tell them not to look at the TV when father and mother do it themselves. Never let them catch you unconscious. Don't have ever anything that they might see about which you are ashamed. Always try to remember that they will always remember that. And they will very seldom remember something that is much more worthwhile, even if you wish it.

Now consciously speaking, if one can and if one wants to understand a child, it is then a question how to create a condition for a child, to grow up and keeping, - what I said a little while ago, - the aspiration in the form of a wish to continue to live. Teach them at an early age the value of life. Teach them that it is necessary to maintain it, not only for themselves but also for others. Don't allow them to kill anything unless it is absolutely necessary. And explain whatever killing there may be in the form perhaps of war. If you can, explain it. If you can explain killing animals for food, try to explain it that way.

But never allow a child to do certain things uselessly. Always tell it to remain occupied, not that it has to work very hard, but occupied, active; not to sit idle, not to lounge around, not to look for the line of least resistance, never to be lazy. Always help it to have that kind of aspiration in a wish to achieve something, perhaps create something, perhaps make something that never existed before; perhaps help the imagination in order to be able for a little

child to visualize possibilities which are now for them potential, but nevertheless, which from that standpoint can be extremely useful to help their imagination to function. The aspiration gradually should change into an inspiration. The aspiration is first directed toward something that is in the outside world that one wants to reach. And at a very early age it already starts, not only by imitation, but also by wishing to be grown up, to wish to behave like someone else who is already so many years older. Because it gives then to the child an idea of being dignified, or something that already ought to be accomplished, and even at their age naturally would start to spoil them. Keep a child at the age wherever they are, and don't allow them to dress up too soon in order to become beautiful. Leave them whatever they are. Never tell to their face how marvellous they have been, this and that. And never show any particular pride to other people like friends, to showing them off and say, "Now, little Willie, he can play the piano already. Little Willie, you play the first sonata of Mozart." It's absolute nonsense. Whenever they accomplish anything, keep it away from the good friends who could admire it. But at the time when you have a chance, you say, "That was done very well." Sometimes even you can praise it and say, "Bravo."

Don't put things on a sentimental basis. Emotionally, quite correct. Make a child feel; after all, that counts. Help it whenever it has any difficulty intellectually. And surely never spare his physical body. Keep it healthy, and then make it work. And have it do physical work. And let it get tired when it's a boy or a son very, very soon in life.

When it is a girl, it's a little different. But teach a girl household, family life, respect for mother, helping, whatever it is; also the chores, cleaning up, whatever happens to be a wifely duty,

although they are still little children. And never call them a wife, but call them a female if you wish, or a daughter, or that what belongs to being grown-up whenever a person in a grown-up relation is called upon to perform to the functions belonging to that particular sex. It's important not to mix them. A boy is a boy, and a girl is a girl; and there is no getting away from it. And whenever one wishes a natural development in a natural relation, it is always on that particular basis that one can say there is a distinction. And, as you know, thank God for the distinction.

It's absolutely necessary to keep this up for some time. It's not at all possible for a child already to have discrimination at an early age. It only comes when they have enough data to compare it. And then they have to judge it by means of their inspiration, not aspiration. Inspiration is the wish of an inner development. This should start quite early. It is a development in the direction by telling them that that what is in the outside world is not all of the world which might be available to them even if they remain unconscious.

Logically one would like them to be conscious. And logically one would like to start early, and like to tell what it is really to be objective, that is, to accept oneself for whatever it is; and never to exaggerate. Never allow hypocrisy; never allow dishonesty. Always, you might say, root it out. You cannot afford it. It will turn against you in your old age, and they will never respect you for ever having allowed it.

Inspiration is a desire for inner life. It will come out of the aspiration, but the direction then is in that what they really are. And in that sense the creation of conditions for the possibi-

lity of the real growth for themselves in whatever they wish to become, and whatever there is that essence is of themselves, - and not the outside manifestations only, - but that what is form and what is visual, what can become touched or whatever there is that one notices with sense organs, that that is filled with a certain content or a certain amount of material which is of a different kind of quality than ordinary man. Inspiration has to be based on the possibility of an ideal, on an imaginary possibility for a child to live in a world of its own, even if it is a fairy-tale, even if it is imagining certain absolutely stupid conditions, but never in the direction of the so-called glorified science of space.

Never bring a child in contact with any form of destruction if you can help it. Avoid it. Cut out the newspapers or the magazines whenever there is anything that has to do with killing human beings. Don't allow them to look at any pictures of Viet-Nam, or any kind of a war. But make them acquainted with the ordinary affairs in nature as they happen naturally when it is based on the fighting for life, not when the fighting is based on who has the largest army. One has to be very selective in giving a child whatever may be needed for it. And sometimes you have to think twice and maybe many, many more times; and a great deal of discussion, if this is good or is that good.

And it always comes back to one thing: what is good for you? And what do you remember at your age; and to what extent can now your son or your daughter profit by whatever experience you have had? That what applies to you in the wish to wake up applies to a child at a fairly early age. Not too early. A child first has to have material of life so that it knows a little bit what life is worth.

If there is a question of consciousness, don't start talking about consciousness too early. They don't understand it. Moreover if they would understand it, they don't know what to do with it because there are not enough facts of life against which they would have to grow. And surely you would not want to take away the joy for them to remain alive.

Never bother a child with problems that don't belong to them. Protect them as long as you can from the things that ultimately will have to be met. But prepare them in such a way that they are strong to meet them. So it is not a question of avoiding talking about it. But do not show that one is affected by worries. If one is worried, if one walks around with a terribly heavy face, if there are certain disappointments in one's own life, if there are of course naturally certain questions that might lead to suffering, if there are difficulties and arguments, always try to protect it, and keep it away from a child as long as is possible.

And don't ever look to a child, one's own child, as a friend to help you, with whom you can communicate and tell them how you are suffering. Wait for a long time. Only when a child has grown up to a certain manhood, - or at least it is for girls past sixteen, and for boys past eighteen, - should you try to even make a friend out of them, or to expect them to have understanding.

To create conditions for them for growth is in the direction of that inspiration of spiritual values. Tell them very early about certain things that exist that are not seen by the eyes. Nevertheless let them believe in a world of possibilities; and for that, imaginations, little stories that one makes up of imaginary figures, but truthful enough and sufficiently miraculous to make them

attractive. Never exaggerate, and don't do stupid things with them. And don't allow them to make all kind of nonsensical drawings if they are inclined. But let them draw, and particularly give them taste, different colors, any number that they wish, whatever they feel like. If they want to draw, let them draw all kind of shapes as long as it is their own. If they want to play, let them play.

But whatever it is, teach them early to understand animals. And if you possibly can, have them care for them. Teach them responsibility for that form of life. Then they will respect life of themselves. And early in age, in their age already, let them become responsible for the morality of themselves, that is, their physical body; to keep their mind also as pure as you can; and to give them a surrounding with beautiful things of all kind, forms of art or religion so that that kind of feeling starts to develop in them.

After that, that what could become maturity for them to stand on will have to form for them a certain wish to grow up in a definite direction. And then when they start wanting to work in some way or other, never allow them to stop until it is finished. Don't allow them for one moment to stop at the point where it becomes a little difficult. Maybe that what they have, wanting to eat, is too big a bite. Then let them do something that is within their means. But let them complete it.

A child's development in the direction of wanting to accomplish something always remains subject to the law of an octave. And there are two points, as you know, that are difficult. One is the shock at "fa". This is where father and mother supply the shock, that is, supply the amount of energy and the possibility of giving new life to a child when its natural inclinations have run out. And I'm now

talking about a child that is developing between the ages of seven and fourteen. There is logically a point in which the initial curiosity dries up. And then they have to have something that can be helpful to overbridge that. Father and mother should supply that. Sometimes teachers can. But if father and mother can do it, they are the ones that are supposed to do it in the first place.

Then when a child continues, and wants to, and having been helped by this particular influx of energy, there comes another point. And it is the "si-do" of that octave. It is very difficult for a person to finish then, because there are all kind of reasons why at that point they would want to give up. And this is an inner question for them. And it is not something that father and mother can help with. But they can only tell them, "You have to finish it." And see if there is anything that then can be helped in some way or other, in line with what they are doing. Not as a chore, but in line with them to develop then across the "si-do", which "si-do" means an extremely difficult compression of all kind of certain pressures that prevent them from finishing it up to its completion.

If you understand about octaves, you know what I mean. The interval of "si-do" is half a note. But the interval at "fa" is one and a half. The "sol-la-si" of that octave has been shifted towards the upper "do". And because of that, the "si-do", being reduced to one half, is compressed. And that what is "fa" is one and a half. It is less dense. For that reason in the "fa" an outside force can enter. But for the "si-do" it is an inner problem. And the satisfaction for a child to overcome that comes from his own development, maybe his imagination, maybe his own little will, maybe something that even might be called already in a child a

conscience.

Keep a child as unspoiled as you can. Give it all the opportunities you can. Devote to a child, father and mother, I would say, almost twenty years. Consider a child of prime importance. It is not business as usual. It is having a child with a responsibility, that then something that father and mother also would like to do perhaps has to be postponed for a little while.

Now, that's a long story about how to educate children. Yes? Bruce Arcieri: I have no children. But in listening, I mean, I guess it's natural, - I just wondered if that kind of way of looking at it, what you were saying, might be applied in different ways? I mean, like towards myself, towards relationships with people and things? I mean there seems to be a lot of insight in what you're saying.

Mr. Nyland: It can be applied in many different directions, Bruce. It only happens to be now regarding something that one can see or notice, or where there may be a very specific problem. But it is exactly the same regarding the possibility of one's own growth in the development of that what I would call a conscious existence as now represented by a completion of Keadjan, or by even the formation of soul. It also can apply in relation to different people, when one wants to consider them unconscious, and to help them to become conscious. In that sense, for them, they will, starting out as little children on an unknown path and in an unknown world; - and they have to be guided to some extent by those who already know a little bit more, and might be able to tell them. And it is exactly the same kind of requirements which are necessary for a father and mother, which are also required for anyone who undertakes the task of educating anyone in the direction of wanting for

them to develop, or perhaps the person who wishes to help already has to some extent. It is true regarding that whatever one starts out with, and which is at the present time undeveloped in oneself. It applies also to anything that one wants to acquire as a dexterity or as something that is an intellectual endeavor, or even the development on an emotional scale. All of that, when it is in its infancy, are like children for one.

Also, in regards to anything that now exists for oneself in the light of that what one is regarding the possibility of further development of oneself to reach a higher scale, or that what should become the proper attitude of oneself regarding something that one calls sometimes God or His Endlessness. All of that are subject to exactly the same rules in principle. And it's only that every once in a while one has to change the name; and that it quite definitely applies in, I wouldn't say in seven different directions, but certainly in more than two or three. Yes?

Question: Two phrases that you used tonight lead me to formulate this question. The two phrases are: first of all, "value of life", and second of all, "Farewell, proud world." And the question is: exactly what kind of man is it that is able to accept death peacefully and calmly? What is this consciousness that this man is trying to achieve, and is just the striving for this consciousness valuable? Like it is said, is consciousness something that we can achieve or is it something that we're constantly striving for?

Mr. Nyland: Well, the assumption is that man as he is at the present time,- and we call him unconscious,- is incomplete; that there is a possibility of a further development which is mostly directed towards the development of his consciousness. Do you know anything about Gurdjieff and the ideas?

Question: A little.

Mr. Nyland: You see, the assumption is that man is a three-centered being in which his physical center, that is, his body, is fully developed. It will not grow any more and it has reached its maximum of possible development. And the only way by which it would be completed, if that is represented by an octave law, is that man now is at the state of "si", and his death would mean a transition from "si" to "do". That would be the end of - -? - of the physical body. As far as his feeling center is concerned, it is half-way. It is not complete, but it has a start. And it is something that exists in man, - we call it feeling - which is then using the body for an expression in some form of manifestation, but nevertheless is located in the solar plexus. And by means of a certain way of practicing this particular pursuit of objectivity, it might be possible that the feeling center would be transferred to his heart; his heart would start to function as a center of emotions, and that at the same time there is a possibility of deepening his feelings or extending them into a wider range.

Now to what extent that is true or not, it doesn't matter. It is only a principle we are talking about. As far as his intellect is concerned, it is what we call consciousness for ordinary human beings, and which is considered from Gurdjieff's standpoint as an unconscious state. It simply implies that there are two other states of consciousness possible, and that the next step would be called self-consciousness, and the other following that would be called cosmic consciousness. Self-consciousness would mean that man in relation to what he is at the present time, unconscious, would actually know as an intellectual body or as an intellectual function,

to be able to think independently of any one of the other two centers, without any interference with any of them, and being able to exist by itself. It would be capable of original thought. And it would be capable of a judgment that is not influenced by any feeling. That you might say is in general the description of self-consciousness.

Cosmic consciousness as the next step would simply mean that man would know his particular place in regard to all living matter, not only on earth, but all the possibilities cosmologically speaking, which can exist, and that man would find his place on earth in relation to that. Self-consciousness would simply mean that man would know his relation to the rest of the world in which he should behave regarding other people in the correct way, and that he for himself would be able to know and to feel and to do whatever is becoming for a man. As a definition by Gurdjieff, it would be called a harmonious man, and the man representing that form of harmony and unity would be in equilibrium and at peace with himself, and would actually be able to define his particular aim in life and the reason for his own existence.. It would imply that in such a man three kind of bodies are developed. It is only a name. It is simply taking a similarity of the physical body and assuming that an emotional body could also exist of which now,-and according to the octave the "do-re-mi" only exists, and for which in the form of consciousness it would be possible to grow out by means of the "sol-la-si", completing the octave - that from the standpoint of Gurdjieff, man, although he has a brain which functions mentally, is utterly incapable of functioning independently, and that most of the time that his energies mentally are being spent, is based on associative values for himself, based on memory and hope and anticipation of that

what is future; and that man at the present time does not know how to live in a moment, and that he has no idea of that what he receives as something as experiencing, that that is recorded simultaneously in his brain.

This is simply a description of saying that man is still unconscious, and that he has for his development the possibility of really developing the whole octave, and that all he has is a "do" which is struck, which at the present time functions for him for ordinary purposes on earth, and which of course is capable of further development. It's a question, you might say, of an assumption that man is still incomplete. But it has a certain validity when one says that man at times can recognize the possibility of another form of existence which happens to strike him accidentally. And still with that accidental happening, he has an experience of something else existing.

And this has given rise to the idea that man at the present time is in a sleeping-waking state, and that for him in a conscious state it could be compared to a state of being really awake. So that there then for man would be possible four states, or at least for the time being four states: physical sleep, ordinary waking state, real awaking state, and also a cosmic awaking state. Those are just terms. They don't mean very much.

Now the question of life. Now the question of holding onto life, or the responsibility for life. Man is born with it in some form which he calls life on earth. It simply means that for the time being when man has a body and is properly fed, it grows out up to these points, as I said, physical body complete, emotional or feeling body up to a certain point halfway, and intellectual

body up to only "do", striking that note as it were, the beginning of that octave without fulfilling it, - that man is simply living this form of life because there is something in him that requires a further maintenance of some kind. Now where it comes from, to what it is related, and what particular place it has in relation to the totality of all life existing, of which we know very little, - but surely we assume religiously that it does exist. It doesn't matter if one is religious or not. One can always assume and know that there are certain things in existence about which we know very little, and must exist because we see certain results of it. You can say it is the universe, it is the Cosmos. It is perhaps satisfaction for a man to assume that there is a Higher Being that exists, or that there are forces which in the beginning one calls spiritual, and afterwards one may call God-like. That religiously expressed, this is the difference between that what is in earth, that what might be on a planetary level, that what may be on a solar level, and whatever is involved in an understanding of the construction of the universe as it is, and the construction of that what we understand about atoms and molecules and so forth. It doesn't matter.

Life apparently exists on earth in three different forms. One is man as a three-centered being, animals as two-centered, and plants as one-centered. It simply means that there are different forms that have reached a certain development, of which the plants are in the lowest range, the animals a little higher, and man has three centers. It is to his particular detriment probably that man has an idea that he might develop. It is doubtful that an animal has that. And a plant without any question does not have it.

But a man can think. And he can project himself in the future.

He also can hope. And he also by associations, by memory, can extrapolate. That is, he can visualize possibilities in the future which at the present time are potential. And the more he starts to think about it, the more he realizes that there may be that kind of a possibility for him also. And when he looks back and starts to compare with what has happened, there are unquestionably certain examples among human beings who are extra-ordinary and who have at that time tried to describe certain experiences which for them, and also for us, are a little bit out of this world.

To what extent there are things that exist out of this world, each person has to decide for himself. It's a question perhaps of belief, and it perhaps may be based on an experience that one has had. And sometimes I think that each person in his ordinary life has at least once or twice certain moments he does not forget. The moments he doesn't forget are of such memory that at the time when he experiences them, there was no question about being alive. But also there was no question that his functions had ceased to exist for that one moment. Whatever the description is, it is something that is now indelibly implanted in my memory. And because of that it has a different quality from ordinary memories which are more or less subject to being effaced in time.

Now what life is I do not know. That is, one has little theories about it. All I can say, pragmatically speaking: that I find myself with life, and that I want to continue it. And also at the time when I become a little bit mature, I become responsible for the maintenance of it. Also that in man there is quite definitely a wish to protect it, that I don't want to die, but I have still this desire for life, a lust for life, a real wish to remain in existence.

And that nevertheless, regarding that as a human being on earth, he is subject to laws of mortality, and that in time, like it or not, he will die. His physical body will simply give out, and that there is a point in his life in his development in which the lines will go down, in which destruction will follow, and in which the destructive processes are going to be more than the processes of maintenance. And then, let's say, senility will set in and at the proper time there is the end.

Now, if in the meantime it might be possible for a person, realizing that he represents in his manifestation a form of life which, you might say, is entrusted to him - and again it is not necessary to assume that God gave it; but simply that he finds himself as being alive as a human being - that he feels not only responsibility, but he would like to maintain it as long as he possibly can provided he remains interested in the wish to maintain it. Now there are thousands of people who lose that particular desire. And after a certain length of time, particularly because their experience has become repetitious, they have no further interest in wanting to live. And when they are forty, fifty or sixty, their interest has been so reduced, and the number of acquaintances that they want to see, or even the activities that they want to be engaged in simply has been reduced to practically nothing. And the picture of such a man is like a spiral gradually drawing within until he finally reaches a point of no further return, and he dies.

For a person who wants to continue to live, and who feels that life is worthwhile - and this is an ethical quality - if one considers it worthwhile to continue to wish to live, then one starts to face whatever there is in life in a different kind of light.

And also one starts to look for a possibility of actually maintaining it regardless of death. And without having to believe in a life hereafter, it simply is then based on the possibility that if it could remain in existence, and it still could remain under my so-called name, that is, if I could remain responsible for it, then many questions that will come up of a spiritual sense, or even ethical, or definitely a deeply religious sense, and surely of a mystical sense, will then start to become solved if one adheres to a certain principle.

The principle is that when man is born, certain forms of life start to exist in the manifestation of what he calls himself; and that when he dies, the assumption is that that as life still remains in existence even if it has no form. And if there is a possibility of extending it, that then during the lifetime of man, he has to work on making a form so that then if his physical body would die, that what is still his life representing him, or part of that what is the totality of all life as represented by that little part which is this man, could continue to exist. And the assumption is that one of the bodies which could be made during the lifetime of a man, if he knows how to build them, could be useful for the further maintenance, you might say, as living quarters for that form of life.

It's not necessary to go too far into that because it runs into philosophy and all kind of things that perhaps people are not interested in. And it doesn't matter. Each person must again decide that for himself. If he believes that his life is over when he dies, of course there is no use talking about it. If he believes that he is an agnostic, and cannot acknowledge that there may be a Higher Being, or that there is no particular law in the universe, or that

things just take place haphazardly, of course he's a fool. Because every indication is that there is nothing haphazard about it, and that we are trying to find what are the laws, even when they apply to the stars and constellations. And there must be definite, definite, very definite reasons why the Cosmos exists in the way it does. And that it is up to man, and man's place, to try to fathom that, and to find out what is the kind of hypothesis that might satisfy him. And perhaps if he accumulates enough data, and the data are more or less in conformity with the hypothesis, that perhaps at some time he can come to an axiomatic statement that there is an Endlessness, or there is some force in the world, or there is a guiding spirit of some kind which maintains the world for whatever it is, without having to explain the reason for the existence of the world, the existence of the planets or the existence of the earth. Or whatever the meaning may be of this solar system in relation to many solar systems, or the Milky Way, or whatever constellations one wants to consider, again I say it is a personal question. One doesn't have to believe it.

But if one continues to become interested and remains interested, and has an inquiring spirit, it doesn't matter in what particular direction a man is, let's say, inclined professionally, he will have to want to find the truth about himself, about all the things that are related to him. And he may be scientific, he may be philosophic, he may be artistic and he may be psychological. It doesn't make any difference where he comes from, he will want to find truth, whatever he can consider truth. And that kind of truth should be independent of any personal interpretation.

You see, this particular aspect of it leads now to the necessity of an objectivity. Because all kind of truth that I now

receive by means of any of these three or four different directions that I would like to follow - sometimes I do follow because of relation or because of profession - simply will give me a number of facts or data about myself and about the rest of the world which I start to interpret. And I can't help it, because I must interpret it with the means I have and whatever there is of my mind in existence which happens to think about it, or whatever I might find intuitively as a result of my feeling. And whatever it is now that I consider of subjective value, if I'm really searching for ultimate truth, I have to become objective. That is, it has to be free from any form of subjectivity.

Now if life can ever be considered that way, and if life actually can give for me that kind of information during my lifetime, that is another question. It may be, and it might have been possible when people had a much longer life span than we have at the present time. And I would almost say that when a person could live three or four hundred years, he probably would then naturally become conscious. But at the present time we are limited. And the life span that we have, - even the years that we have spent, and particularly in the beginning, - is usually spent in such a way that we lose ourselves already much too early, and that we devote a tremendous amount of time and energy to nonsensical subjects which are of no particular use. And that what really should be emphasized is the possibility of a development of a different kind, having in mind that if that could develop, that it would become independent of the existence of earth, if earth belongs to a solar system which is our solar system, and if the growth or evolution would be indicated by a direction towards the sun.

After all it is again an assumption. But if there is a balance in our solar system between earth, planets and sun on one side, and the moon - and sometimes the assumption is that there is another little planet on the other side of the moon, which keeps the earth in balance - that then mankind as on earth, represented by organic kingdom, has a very definite function to fulfill in order to maintain the equilibrium of that particular what is called sometimes a 'ray of creation' in a smaller sense, only belonging to our solar system. This of course, physically speaking, that is as we see it, is of course most likely true.

Psychologically speaking, it is a different thing. If man represents a world, he also must then have in him a sun, a planet or several planets, a body which is the earth, and his moon, and perhaps his, what Gurdjieff calls 'Anulios'. It's interesting again to philosophize about it and to see what psychologically the meaning would be of these different terms. Nevertheless there is a very good assumption if one says, "I want to find out what the Cosmos is", and it is a little bit too far away from me, that I try to find it out by means of that what is my own world, and then express it in psychological terms which are absolutely parallel to what might take place on a larger scale in the cosmos, macrocosmos, microcosmos, whatever it is that one talks about.

Now in how far one wants to believe it, or in how far it has particular meaning, or what is the form of life that can be maintained, or what is the reason for life being encased or put in prison for a little while in the form of a human body, or what is the reason for man's existence on earth - all these are very interesting questions, but they don't really belong to a man until much later

when he has found a place for himself. As long as a person has no particular questions about his life and is not questioning the validity of life, but simply accepts it, and without any further reason the assumption is that that is all there is to it, and that one has to become a good man on earth. And in relationship with other people that one becomes kind or whatever it may be, whatever culture prescribes, whatever ordinary civilization in which we live prescribes. And that we stay within the law, and that we are more or less honest. Or that when we are not honest, that everybody understands that we are a little bit dishonest. All of that are ordinary earth questions. And they are very interesting from the standpoint of earth. And when that is all that one is interested in, it's very nice to become a good man.

I personally of course believe it is not all of it. I think it is necessary that man has to understand himself on earth. He has to know what to do and how to behave properly. But also he has an additional task: not only that he pays for his existence as it has been given to him by Mother Nature, but also that he has a very definite aim in finding himself on earth and then having to think about possibilities of growth.

The growth of man depends now on the development of his consciousness. Because the consciousness as he has at the present time is limited, and remains limited to all kind of subjective values. When I can think about the possibility of an objectivity, I also must think then: how would it be possible to perceive objective values? And it would be fine if that what is now subjective could become an objective consciousness. So you see I'm up against that because I'm now thinking in a subjective way about something that should become objective. And that is why it is extremely difficult

to believe even in the possibility of extricating oneself as if one wishes to lift oneself out of the state of unconsciousness with one's own bootstraps. And how can I find the point for a particular crowbar, the fulcrum, in order to lift this earth, that is, my body?

I think in the beginning it starts with the possibility of hoping that one can find a certain way, that if it is indicated in what direction I should go, that then gradually one assumes that as if one could become conscious, then acting in accordance with that, one gradually could become conscious in the acquisition of certain data which become more permanent. It's a certain scientific way of investigation. And we know it astronomically. We know very well what it means. When we talk about an ellipse and a parabola, and a hyperbola, they are all of the same kind of configurations which we assume in space whenever we have a body that doesn't know what particular road it takes. We start with an assumption.

All the different verities in science, physical, chemical or whatever, always have started with the assumption of something existing, and then working with practical values and experimentation, trying to prove that the assumptions originally were correct. And that whenever data are received in any form which become scientifically, and now in that real sense objectively correct, that then they conform to the original thesis. Or if they are not, we have to change the hypothesis. The functions over the ages, you might say, of the last three or four centuries of the development of science are very obvious. And we know it. The question of combustion, question of octaves, question of relativity, question of atomic structure, all of that have been subject to all kind of experimentation

and verification of certain laws, sometimes actually confirmed, sometimes had to be discarded and substituted by something else that seemed more plausible.

It's exactly the same as far as objective science is concerned. And if one wishes to find out what objective science could give one, one has to start working. So you see, that would answer the question. The mind at the present time cannot contain it. But if a mind could develop in the proper and the correct direction, it might be possible for a mind really to become conscious.

Question: (same) I understand the goal, and I understand the value of the goal. But exactly how do we go about trying to achieve the goal?

Mr. Nyland: That is another point. All I can say about that is a very simple little rule: just to accept oneself as one is, impartially and simultaneously. That is the answer. That is the method, you might say, in a nutshell: observation, in that sense, with impartiality, with simultaneity, that is, living and recording in a moment, in that particular section of the brain which is still virgin field, which has as yet not been spoiled by any form of association. There are sections fortunately in man, and that fact in itself indicates that man could grow if he only knew this particular key to evolution.

And the key has been known, and has many times been lost. That of course is true throughout the whole ages. We know at times civilizations have been able to find it and live in accordance with it; and it was completely destroyed. At the present time that kind of secret doctrine of course has existed all throughout - How Gurdjieff wanted to bring it about, or rather write about it,

or how other people also have touched on it and have surely indicated some of the direction, sometimes knowingly, sometimes by accident: of course there's no question about it. It is a universal wisdom. It always has existed, and sometimes became available, and sometimes simply receded in the dark recesses of history. Sometime we'll talk about it.

It's enough, huh? - - - Oh, you're almost at the end. All right. So. My, this was a long series, wasn't it, huh? Heavens! I'm sure you've forgotten ninety percent.

Good-night, everybody. See you next week.